

On existence and uniqueness of the carrying simplex for competitive dynamical systems

Morris W. Hirsch
University of California, Berkeley
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dedicated to Professor Hal Smith on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday

g

Introduction

Consider a system of n competing species whose states are characterized by vectors in the closed positive cone $K := [0, \infty)^n \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. When time is discrete the development of the system is given by a continuous map $T: K \rightarrow K$. For continuous time is continuous the development is governed by a periodic system of differential equations $\dot{x} = F(t, x) \equiv F(t+1, x)$. In this case T denotes the Poincaré map.

For discrete time the *trajectory* of a state x is the sequence $\{T^k x\}$, also denoted by $\{x(k)\}$, where k varies over the set $\mathbf{N}$ of nonnegative integers. In the case of an autonomous differential equation (i.e., F is independent of t), the trajectory of x is the solution curve through x , denoted by $T^t x$ or $x(t)$, where $t \in [0, \infty)$. In both cases the *limit set* $\omega(x)$ is the set of limit points of sequences $x(t_k)$ where $t_k \rightarrow \infty$.

In order to exclude spontaneous generation we assume $T_i(x) = 0$ when $x_i = 0$. Thus there are functions $G_i: K \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, assumed continuous, such that

$$T_i(x) = x_i G_i(x), \quad (x \in K, \quad i = 1, \dots, n) \quad (1)$$

For continuous time we assume the differential equation is a system of having the form $\dot{x}_i = x_i G_i(t, x)$. If x_i is interpreted as the size of species i then $G_i(x)$ is its *per capita* growth rate.

We take “competition” to mean that increasing any one species does not tend to increase the *per capita* growth rate of any other species, conventionally modeled by the assumption

$$\frac{\partial G_i}{\partial x_j} \leq 0, \quad (i \neq j)$$

A *carrying simplex* for the map T is a compact invariant hypersurface $\Sigma \subset K$ such that every trajectory except the the origin is asymptotic with a trajectory in Σ , and Σ is unordered for the standard vector order in K . In the case of an autonomous differential equation we require that Σ be invariant under the maps T^t for all $t \geq 0$. Some maps have no carrying simplices, others have infinitely many. Our main results gives conditions guaranteeing a unique carrying simplex.

Terminology

A set $Y \subset \mathbb{K}$ is *positively invariant* under a map or an autonomous differential equation if it contains the trajectories of all its points, so that $T^t Y \subset Y$ for all $t \geq 0$ (here $t \in \mathbb{N}$ or $[0, \infty)$ as appropriate). We call Y *invariant* if $T^t Y = Y$ for all $t \geq 0$.

If S is a differentiable map, its matrix of partial derivatives matrix at p is denoted by $S'(p)$.

The geometry of $\mathbb{K}$ plays an important role. For each subset $\mathbf{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ the $\mathbf{I}$ 'th *facet* of $\mathbb{K}$ is

$$\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{I}} = \{x \in \mathbb{K} : x_j = 0 \iff j \notin \mathbf{I}\}$$

Thus $\mathbb{K}_{\{i\}}$ is the i 'th positive coordinate axis. A facet is *proper* if it lies in the boundary of $\mathbb{K}$, meaning $\mathbf{I} \neq \{0\}$. The intersection of facets is a facet: $\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{I}} \cap \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{J}} = \mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{I} \cup \mathbf{J}}$. The boundary of $\mathbb{K}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, denoted by $\dot{\mathbb{K}}$, is the union of the proper facets. Each $x \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$ belongs to the unique facet $\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{I}(x)}$ where $\mathbf{I}(x) := \{i : x_i > 0\}$.

For each $n \times n$ matrix A and nonempty $\mathbf{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ we define the principal submatrix

$$A_{\mathbf{I}} := [A_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbf{I}}$$

The *vector order* in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the relation is defined by $x \succeq y \iff x - y \in \mathbb{K}$. We write $x \succ y$ if also $x \neq y$. For each set $\mathbf{I} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ we write $x \succ_{\mathbf{I}} y$ if $x, y \in \overline{\mathbb{K}_{\mathbf{I}}}$ and $x \succ y$, and $x \succ_{\mathbf{I}} y$ if also $x_i > y_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{I}$. The reverse relations are denoted by $\preceq, \prec$ and so forth.

The *closed order interval* defined by $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is

$$[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : a \preceq x \preceq b\}$$

Carrying simplices

A *carrying simplex* is a set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$ having the following properties:

(CS1) Σ is compact and invariant.

(CS2) for every $x \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0\}$ the trajectory of x is asymptotic with some $y \in \Sigma$, i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} |T^t x - T^t y| = 0$.

(CS3) Σ is *unordered*: if $x, y \in \Sigma$ and $x \succeq y$ then $x = y$.

It follows that each line in $\mathbb{K}$ through the origin meets Σ in a unique point. Therefore Σ is mapped homeomorphically onto the unit $(n-1)$ -simplex

$$\Delta^{n-1} := \{x \in \mathbb{K} : \sum_i x_i = 1\}$$

by the radial projection $x \mapsto x / (\sum_i x_i)$.

Long-term dynamical properties of trajectories are accurately reflected by the dynamics in Σ by (CS1) and (CS2), and (CS3) means that Σ has simple topology and geometry. The existence of a carrying simplex has significant implications for limit sets $\omega(x)$:

- If $x > 0$ then $\omega(x) \subset \Sigma$, a consequence of (CS2). In particular, Σ contains all nontrivial fixed points and periodic orbits.
- If $a, b \in K$ are distinct limit points of respective states $x, y \succeq 0$ (possibly the same state), then there exist i, j such that $a_i > b_i$, $a_j < b_j$; this follows from (CS3). Thus either $\omega(x) = \omega(y)$, or else there exist i, j such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) - y_i(t) > 0, \quad \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t) - y_j(t) < 0$$

In many cases Σ is the *global attractor* for the dynamics in $K \setminus \{0\}$, meaning that as t goes to infinity, the distance from $x(t)$ to Σ goes to zero uniformly for x in any given compact subset of $K \setminus \{0\}$. This implies (Wilson [35]) that there is a continuous function $V: K \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that if $x \neq 0$ then

- $V(x) = 0 \iff x \in \Sigma$,
- $V(x(t)) < V(x) \iff x \notin \Sigma$,
- $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} V(x(t)) = 0$,

We can think of V as an “asymptotic conservation law”. While there are many such functions for any carrying simplex, it is rarely possible to find a formula for any of them.

Before stating results we give two simple examples for $n = 1$:

Example 1

If T is the time-one map for the flow defined by the logistic differential equation

$$\dot{x} = rx(\sigma - x), \quad r, \sigma > 0, \quad (x \geq 0),$$

the carrying simplex is just the classical carrying capacity σ . Here one can define $V(x) = |x - \sigma|$ for $x > 0$.

Example 2

Consider the map

$$T: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty), \quad Tx = xe^{b-ax}, \quad b, a > 0, \quad x \in [0, \infty) \quad (2)$$

Note that

$$T'(x) = (1 - x)e^{b-ax}, \quad T'(b/a) = 1 - b$$

If there is a carrying simplex, it has to be the unique positive fixed point b/a , in which case $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T^k x = b/a$ for all $x > 0$.

If $b \leq 1$ then b/a is the carrying simplex. In this case the maximum value of T is taken uniquely at $1/a \geq b/a$. If $0 < x < b/a$ then $x < Tx < b/a$, hence $T^k x \rightarrow b/a$. It follows that if some $T^j x < b/a$ then again $T^k x \rightarrow b/a$. If the entire orbit of x is $> b/a$ then the sequence $\{T^k x\}$ decreases to a fixed point $\geq b/a$, hence to be b/a .

If $b > 2$ there is no carrying simplex. For then $|T'(b/a)| > 1$, making b/a a locally repelling fixed point. The only way the trajectory of $y \neq b/a$ can converge to b/a is for $T^j y = b/a$ for some $j > 0$. The set of such points y is nowhere dense because T is a nonconstant analytic function, hence there is no carrying simplex. For sufficiently large b the dynamics is chaotic.

Example 5, below, is an n -dimensional generalization of Equation (2).

We say that T is *strictly sublinear* in a set $X \subset \mathbf{K}$ if the following holds: $x \in X$ and $0 < \lambda < 1$ imply $\lambda x \in X$ and

$$\lambda T(x) \prec T(\lambda x), \quad (x \in X \setminus 0) \quad (3)$$

Thus the restricted map $T|X$ exhibits what economists call “decreasing returns to scale.”

A state x *majorizes* a state y if $x \succ y$, and x *strictly majorizes* y if $x_i > 0$ implies $x_i > y_i$.

The map $T: \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ is *strictly retrotone* in a subset $X \subset \mathbf{K}$ if for all $x, y \in X$ we have

$$Tx \text{ majorizes } Ty \implies x \text{ strictly majorizes } y$$

Equivalently:

$$x, y \in X \cap \overline{\mathbf{K}}_{\mathbf{I}} \text{ and } Tx \succ Ty \implies x \gg_{\mathbf{I}} y$$

The origin is a *repellor* if $T^{-1}(0) = 0$ and there exists $\delta > 0$ and an open neighborhood $W \subset \mathbf{K}$ of the origin such that $\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} |T^k x| \geq \delta$ uniformly in compact subsets of $W \setminus \{0\}$.

If in addition there is a global attractor Γ , as will be generally assumed, then Γ contains a global attractor Γ_0 for $T| \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$. In

We will assume T is given Equation (1) has the following properties:

(C0) $T^{-1}(0) = 0$ and $G_i(0) > 1$.

The first condition means that no nontrivial population dies out in finite time. The second means that small populations increase.

(C1) *There is a global attractor Γ containing a neighborhood of 0.*

Together with (C0) this implies that there is a global attractor $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma$ for $T| \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$. The connected component of the origin in $\mathbf{K} \setminus \Gamma_0$ is the *repulsion basin* $B(0)$.

(C2) *T is strictly sublinear in a neighborhood of Γ .*

This holds when $0 < \lambda < 1 \implies G(x) \prec G(\lambda x)$.

(C3) *T is strictly retrotone in a neighborhood of the global attractor*

A similar property was introduced by Smith [29].

Denote the set of boundary points of Γ in $\mathbf{K}$ by $\partial_{\mathbf{K}} \Gamma$.

Theorem 3 *When (C0)—(C3) hold, the unique carrying simplex is $\Sigma = \partial_{\mathbf{K}} \Gamma = \partial_{\mathbf{K}} B(0)$, and Σ is the global attractor for $T| \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$.*

The proof will appear elsewhere.

The same hypotheses yield further information. It turns out that if $T| \Gamma$ is locally injective (which Smith assumed), it is a homeomorphism of Γ ; and in any case the following condition holds:

(C4) *The restriction of T to each positive coordinate axis $\mathbf{K}_{\{i\}}^o$ has a globally attracting fixed point $q_{(i)}$.*

We call $q_{(i)}$ an *axial* fixed point. Denoting its i 'th coordinate by $q_i > 0$, we set

$$q := (q_1, \dots, q_n) = \sum_i q_{(i)}$$

Smith [29] shows that (C3) and (C4) imply (C1) with $\Gamma \subset [0, q]$. In many cases the easiest way to establish a global attractor is to compute the axial fixed points and apply Smith's result.

The following condition implies (C3) for maps T having the form (1) when G is C^1 :

(C5) *If $x \in K \setminus \{0\}$, the matrix $[G'(x)]_{\mathbf{I}(x)}$ has strictly negative entries*

For $d \in \mathbf{R}^n$ we denote the diagonal matrix D with diagonal entries $D_{ii} := d_i$ by $[d]^{\text{diag}}$ and also by $[d_i]^{\text{diag}}$. The $n \times n$ identity matrix is denoted by I .

A computation shows that

$$T'(x) = [G(x)]^{\text{diag}} + [x]^{\text{diag}} G'(x).$$

When x is such that all $G_i(x) > 0$, this can be written

$$\begin{aligned} T'(x) &= [G(x)]^{\text{diag}} (I - M(x)), \\ M(x) &:= - \left[\frac{x_i}{G_i(x)} \right]^{\text{diag}} G'(x), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and the entries in the $n \times n$ matrix $M(x)$ are

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ij}(x) &:= \frac{-x_i}{G_i(x)} \frac{\partial G_i}{\partial x_j}(x), \\ &= -x_i \frac{\partial \log G_i}{\partial x_j}(x) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note that (C5) implies $M_{ij}(x) > 0$.

The *spectral radius* $\rho(M)$ of an $n \times n$ matrix M is the maximum of the norms of its eigenvalues. It is a standard result that if $\rho(M) < 1$ then $I - M$ is invertible and $(I - M)^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} M^k$.

Theorem 4 *Suppose G is C^1 . Assume (C0), (C1), (C2), (C5), let (C4) hold with $[0, q] \subset X$, and assume*

$$0 \prec x \preceq q \implies \rho(M(x)) < 1 \tag{6}$$

Then (C3) holds, whence the hypotheses and conclusions of Theorem 3 are valid.

The proof will be given elsewhere. Under the same hypotheses the following conclusions also hold:

- $T|_{\Gamma}$ is a diffeomorphism
- if $x \in \Gamma \cap K_{\mathbf{I}}^o$ then the matrix $[T'(x)_{\mathbf{I}}]^{-1}$ has strictly positive entries.

When (C5) holds, either of the following conditions implies (6):

$$0 \prec x \preceq q \implies \sum_i M_{ij}(x) < 1, \quad (j = 1, \dots, n) \quad (7)$$

$$0 \prec x \preceq q \implies \sum_j M_{ij}(x) < 1 \quad (i = 1, \dots, n) \quad (8)$$

Each of these conditions implies that the largest positive eigenvalue of $M(x)$ is the spectral radius by (C5) and the theorem of Perron and Frobenius [2], and that this eigenvalue is bounded above by the maximal row sum and the maximal column sum by Gershgorin's theorem [3].

Competition models

In the following illustrative examples we calculate bounds on parameters that make row sums of $M(x)$ obey (7), validating the hypotheses and conclusion of Theorem 4 and 3.

Example 5

Consider a multidimensional version of Equation (2), based on an ecological model of May & Oster [22]:

$$T: \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}, \quad T_i(x) = x_i \exp(B_i - \sum_j A_{ij}x_j), \quad B_i, A_{ij} > 0 \quad (9)$$

This map is not locally injective. In a small neighborhood of the origin T is approximated by the discrete-time Lotka-Volterra map $\hat{T}$ defined by $(\hat{T}x)_i = (\exp B_i)x_i(1 - \sum_j A_{ij}x_j)$, but as $\hat{T}$ does not map $\mathbb{K}$ into itself, it is not useful as a global model. T has a global attractor Γ and a source at the origin, so a carrying simplex is plausible. But the special case $n = 1$, treated in Example 2, shows that further restrictions are needed.

Condition (C5) holds with $G_i(x) = \exp(B_i - \sum_j A_{ij}x_j)$. Evidently these functions are strictly decreasing in x , which implies T is strictly sublinear. (C4) holds with $q_i = B_i/A_{ii}$, and it can be shown that $\Gamma \subset [0, q]$. In (4) the matrix entries are

$$M_{ij}(x) = x_i A_{ij} \quad (10)$$

Therefore Theorem 4 shows that if

$$0 \prec x \preceq q \implies \rho(M(x)) < 1 \quad (11)$$

then $\partial_{\mathbb{K}}\Gamma$ is the unique carrying simplex and $T|_{\Gamma}$ is a diffeomorphism. From (7), (8) and (10) we see that (11) holds in case one of the following conditions is satisfied:

$$\frac{B_i}{A_{ii}} \sum_j A_{ij} < 1 \text{ for all } i, \quad (12)$$

or

$$\frac{B_i}{A_{ii}} \sum_j A_{ij} < 1 \text{ for all } j \quad (13)$$

These conditions thus imply a unique carrying simplex, by Theorem 4.

To arrive at a biological interpretation of (12), we rewrite it as

$$q_i \sum_j A_{ij} < 1 \quad (14)$$

where $q_i := \frac{B_i}{A_{ii}}$ is the axial equilibrium for species i , that is, its stable population in the absence of competitors. Equation (9) tells us that A_{ij} is the logarithmic rate by which the growth of population i inhibits the growth rate of population j . Thus (14) means that the average of these rates must be rather small compared to the single species equilibrium for population i . The plausibility of this is left to the reader, as is the biological meaning of (13).

When $n = 1$, Equation (9) defines the map $Tx = xe^{b-ax}$ of Example 2. The positive fixed point is $q = a/b$, and both (12) and (13) boil down to $b < 1$, which was shown to imply a unique carrying simplex. That example also showed that there is no carrying simplex when $b > 2$. As Equation (9) reduces to Example 2 on each coordinate axis, we see that Equation (9) lacks a carrying simplex provided

$$\frac{B_i}{A_{ii}} \sum_j A_{ij} > 2 \text{ for some } i,$$

or

$$\frac{B_i}{A_{ii}} \sum_i A_{ij} > 2 \text{ for some } j$$

Example 6

Consider a competing population model due to Leslie & Gower [19]:

$$T: K \rightarrow K, \quad T_i x = \frac{C_i x_i}{1 + \sum_j A_{ij} x_j}, \quad C_i, A_{ij} > 0 \quad (15)$$

Note that T need not be locally injective. When $n = 1$ all trajectories converge to 0 if $C \leq 1$, and all nonconstant trajectories converge to $\frac{C-1}{A}$ if $C > 1$. The case $n = 2$ is thoroughly analyzed by Cushing *et al.* [6].

Here

$$G_i(x) := \frac{C_i}{1 + \sum_j A_{ij} x_j} > 0,$$

hence (C5) holds. We assume $C_i > 1$, guaranteeing (C4) with $q_i = \frac{C_i-1}{A_{ii}}$. In (5) we have

$$M_{ij}(x) = \frac{x_i A_{ij}}{1 + \sum_l A_{il} x_l} < x_i A_{ij}.$$

so the row sums of $M(x)$ are < 1 for all x provided $q_i \sum_j A_{ij} < 1$. Therefore when

$$1 < C_i < 1 + \frac{A_{ii}}{\sum_j A_{ij}},$$

Theorems 3 and 4 yield the following conclusions: There is a global attractor $\Gamma \subset [0, q]$, the unique carrying simplex is $\partial_K \Gamma$, and $T|_\Gamma$ is a diffeomorphism.

Example 7

Consider a recurrent, fully connected neural network of n cells (or “cell assemblies”, Hebb [11]). At discrete times $t = 0, 1, \dots$, cell i has activation level $x_i(t) \geq 0$ and the state of the system is $x(t) := (x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t))$. Cell i receives an input signal $s_i(x(t))$ which is a weighted sum of all the activations plus a bias term. Its activation is multiplied by a positive transfer function τ_i evaluated on s_i , resulting in the new activation $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t)\tau_i(s_i)$.

We assume each cell’s activation tends to decrease the activations of all cells, but each cell receives a bias that tends to increase its activation. We model this with negative weights $-A_{ij} < 0$, positive biases $B_i > 0$, and positive increasing transfer functions. For simplicity we assume all the transfer functions are e^σ where $\sigma: [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is C^1 . States evolve according to the law

$$T: \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}, \quad T_i(x) = x_i \exp \sigma(s_i(x)), \quad s_i(x) := B_i - \sum_j A_{ij}x_j$$

We also assume

$$\sigma(0) = 0, \quad \sigma'(s) > 0, \quad \sup \sigma'(s) = \gamma < \infty, \quad (s \in \mathbf{R}) \quad (16)$$

It is easy to verify that (C1), (C2), (C4) and (C5) hold, with

$$q_i := \frac{B_i}{A_{ii}}, \quad G_i(x) := \exp \sigma(B_i - \sum_j A_{ij}x_j), \quad M_{ij} = \sigma'(s_i(x))A_{ij} \quad (17)$$

where $M_{ij}(x)$ is defined as in (5).

It turns out that for given weights and biases, the system has a unique carrying simplex provided the *gain parameter* γ in (16) is not too large. It suffices to assume

$$\gamma < \left[\max_i \left(\frac{B_i}{A_{ii}} \sum_j A_{ij} \right) \right]^{-1} \quad (18)$$

For then (16), (17), (18) imply (8) and hence (C3), so Theorems 3 and 4 imply a unique carrying simplex for T .

There is a vast literature on neural networks, going back to the seminal book of Hebb [11]. Network models of competition were analyzed in the pioneering works of Grossberg [7] and Cohen & Grossberg [5]. Generic convergence in certain types of competitive and cooperative networks is proved in Hirsch [15]. Levine’s book [20] has mathematical treatments of several aspects of neural network dynamics.

Competitive differential equations

Consider a periodic differential equation in $\mathbf{K}$:

$$\dot{u}_i = u_i G_i(t, u_1, \dots, u_n) \equiv u_i G_i(t+1, u_1, \dots, u_n), \quad t, u_i \geq 0, \quad (i = 1, \dots, n) \quad (19)$$

where the maps $G_i: \mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ are C^1 . The solution with initial value $u(0) = x$ is denoted by $t \mapsto T_t x$. Solutions are assumed to be defined for all $t \geq 0$. Each map T_t maps $\mathbf{K}$

diffeomorphically onto a relatively open set in K that contains the origin. The *Poincaré map* is $T := T_1$.

We postulate the following conditions for Equation (19):

(A1) *total competition*: $\frac{\partial G_i}{\partial x_j} \leq 0$, $(i, j = 1, \dots, n)$

(A2) *strong self-competition*: $\sum_{k \in I(x)} \frac{\partial G_k}{\partial x_k}(t, x) < 0$

(A3) *decrease of large population*: $G_i(t, x) < 0$ for x_i sufficiently large.

This implies existence of a *global attractor* for the Poincaré map T .

(A4) *increase of small populations*: $G_i(t, 0) > 0$.

Under these assumptions there are two obvious candidates for a carrying simplex for T , namely $\partial_K B$ and $\partial_K \Gamma$, the respective boundaries in K of $B(0)$ and Γ . Existence of a unique carrying simplex implies $\partial_K B = \partial_K \Gamma$.

Theorem 8 *Assume system (19) has properties (A1)—(A4). Then there is a unique carrying simplex, and it is the global attractor for the dynamics in $K \setminus \{0\}$.*

The proof, which will be given elsewhere, uses a subtle dynamical consequence of competition discovered by Wang & Jiang [34, page 630]: If $u(t), v(t)$ are solutions to Equation (19) such that for all i

$$u_i(t) < v_i(t), \quad (s < t < s_1),$$

then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{u_i}{v_i} \right) > 0, \quad (s < t < s_1)$$

Example 9

A competitive, periodic Volterra-Lotka system in K of the form

$$\dot{u}_i = u_i \left(B_i(t) - \sum_j A_{ij}(t) u_j \right), \quad B_i, A_{ij} > 0$$

satisfies (A1)—(A4) and thus the conclusion of Theorem 8.

Example 10

Several mathematicians have investigated carrying simplex dynamics for competitive, autonomous Volterra-Lotka systems in K having the form

$$\dot{u}_i = u_i \left(B_i - \sum_j A_{ij} u_j \right) := u_i H_i(u_1, \dots, u_n), \quad B_i, A_{ij} > 0 \quad (20)$$

The best results are for $n = 3$: the interesting dynamics is on a 2-dimensional cell, therefore the Poincaré-Bendixson theorem [10] precludes any kind of chaos and makes the dynamics easy to analyze. The dynamics for generic systems were classified by M.L. Zeeman [39], with computer graphics exhibited in Zeeman [40]. She proved that in many cases simple algebraic criteria on the coefficients determine the existence of limit cycles and Hopf bifurcations.

Van den Driessche and Zeeman [33] applied Zeeman’s classification to model two competing species with species 1, but not species 2, susceptible to disease. They showed that if species 1 can drive species 2 to extinction in the absence of disease, then the introduction of disease can weaken species 1 sufficiently to permit stable or oscillatory coexistence of both species.

Zeeman & Zeeman [42] showed that generically, but not in all cases, the carrying simplex is uniquely determined by the dynamics in the 2-dimensional facets of K . Systems with two and three limit cycles have been found by Hofbauer & So [18], Lu & Luo [21]), and Gyllenberg *et al.* [8]. No examples of Equation (20) with four limit cycles are known.

More information on the dynamics of Equation (20) can be found in [32, 36, 37, 41, 43].

Background

In an important paper on competitive maps, Smith [29] investigated C^2 diffeomorphisms T of K . Under assumptions similar to (C0)—(C5) he proved T is strictly retrotone and established the existence of the global attractor Γ and the repulsion basin $B(0)$. He showed that $\partial_K B(0)$ and $\partial_K \Gamma$ are compact unordered invariant sets homeomorphic to the unit simplex, and each of them contains all periodic orbits except the origin. His conjecture that $\partial_K B = \partial_K \Gamma$ remains unproved from his hypotheses. He also showed that for certain types of competitive planar maps every bounded trajectory converges, extending earlier results of Hale & Somolinos [9], de Mottoni & Schiaffino [27].

Using Smith’s results and those of Hess & Poláčik [12], Wang & Jiang [34] obtained unique carrying simplices for competitive C^2 maps.

For further results on the smoothness, geometry and dynamics of carrying simplices, see [1, 23, 24, 25, 26].

Mea culpa Uniqueness of the carrying simplex for Equation (20) was claimed in Hirsch [13], but M.L. Zeeman [38] discovered an error in the proof of Proposition 2.3(d).

References

- [1] M. Benaïm, On invariant hypersurfaces of strongly monotone maps. *J. Differential Eqns.* **137** (1997), 302–319
- [2] A. Berman, M. Neumann & R. Stern, “Nonnegative Matrices in Dynamic Systems.” John Wiley & Sons, New York 1989
- [3] R. Brualdi & S. Mellendorf, Regions in the complex plane containing the eigenvalues of a matrix. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **101** (1994), 975–985
- [4] L. Chua & T. Roska, “Cellular Neural Networks Foundations and Applications.” Cambridge University Press, Cambridge England 2001
- [5] M. Cohen & S. Grossberg, Absolute stability of global pattern formation and parallel memory storage by competitive neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Systems Man Cybernet.* **13** (1983), 815–826

- [6] J. Cushing, S. Levarge, N. Chitnis & S. Henson, Some discrete competition models and the competitive exclusion principle. *J. Difference Eqns. Appl.* **10** (2004) no. 13–15, 1139–1151
- [7] S. Grossberg, Competition, decision and consensus. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **66** (1978), 470–493.
- [8] M. Gyllenberg, P. Yan & Y. Wang, A 3D competitive Lotka-Volterra system with three limit cycles: a falsification of a conjecture by Hofbauer and So. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **19** (2006), 1–7
- [9] J. Hale & A. Somolinos, Competition for fluctuating nutrient. *J. Math. Biol.* **18** (1983), 255–280
- [10] P. Hartman, "Ordinary Differential Equations." Wiley, New York 1964
- [11] D. Hebb, "The Organization of Behavior." Wiley, New York 1949
- [12] P. Hess and P. Poláčik, Boundedness of prime periods of stable cycles and convergence to fixed points in discrete monotone dynamical systems. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **24** (1993), 1312–1330
- [13] M.W. Hirsch, Systems of differential equations which are competitive or cooperative. III: Competing species. *Nonlinearity* **1** (1988), 51–71
- [14] M.W. Hirsch, Stability and convergence in strongly monotone dynamical systems. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **383** (1988), 1–58
- [15] M.W. Hirsch, Convergent activation dynamics in continuous time neural networks. *Neural Networks* **2** (1989), 331–351
- [16] M.W. Hirsch & H. Smith, "Monotone dynamical systems, Handbook of Differential Equations: Ordinary Differential Equations, Vol. 2," 239–258. A. Cañada, P. Drábek & A. Fonda editors. Elsevier North Holland, Boston 2005
- [17] M.W. Hirsch & H. Smith, Monotone maps: a review. *J. Difference Eqns. Appl.* **11** (2005), 379–398
- [18] J. Hofbauer and J. W.-H. So, Multiple limit cycles for three dimensional competitive Lotka-Volterra equations. *Appl. Math. Lett.* **7** (1994), 65–70
- [19] P. Leslie & J. Gower, The properties of a stochastic model for two competing species. *Biometrika* **45** (1958), 316–330
- [20] D. Levine, "Introduction to Neural and Cognitive Modeling." Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ 2000
- [21] Z. Lu & Y. Luo, Two limit cycles in three-dimensional Lotka-Volterra systems. *Comput. Math. Appl.* **44** (2002), 51–66

- [22] R. May & G. Oster, Bifurcations and dynamic complexity in simple ecological models. *Amer. Naturalist* **110** (1976), 573–599
- [23] J. Mierczyński, The C^1 property of carrying simplices for a class of competitive systems of ODEs. *J. Differential Eqns.* **111** (1994), 385–409
- [24] J. Mierczyński, On smoothness of carrying simplices. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **127** (1999) no. 2, 543–551
- [25] J. Mierczyński, On peaks in carrying simplices. *Colloq. Math.* **91** (1999), 285–292
- [26] J. Mierczyński, Smoothness of carrying simplices for three-dimensional competitive systems: a counterexample. *Dynam. Contin. Discrete Impuls. Systems* **6** (1999), 147–154
- [27] P. de Mottoni & A. Schiaffino, Competition systems with periodic coefficients: a geometric approach. *J. Math. Biol.* **11** (1981) no. 3, 319–335
- [28] P. Poláčik and I. Tereščák, Convergence to cycles as a typical asymptotic behavior in smooth strongly monotone discrete-time dynamical systems. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **116** (1992), 339–360
- [29] H. Smith, Periodic competitive differential equations and the discrete dynamics of competitive maps. *J. Differential Eqns.* **64** (1986) no. 2, 165–194
- [30] P. Smolensky, M. Mozer & D. Rumelhart (editors), “Mathematical Perspectives on Neural Networks,” Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah NJ 1996
- [31] H. Thieme, “Mathematics in Population Biology.” Princeton University Press, Princeton 2003
- [32] P. van den Driessche & M.L. Zeeman, Three-dimensional competitive Lotka-Volterra systems with no periodic orbits. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **58** (1998), 227–234
- [33] P. van den Driessche & M.L. Zeeman, Disease induced oscillations between two competing species, *SIAM J. Applied Dyn. Sys.* **3** 2004, 604–619 (electronic)
- [34] Y. Wang & J. Jiang, Uniqueness and attractivity of the carrying simplex for discrete-time competitive dynamical systems. *J. Differential Eqns.* **186** (2002), 611–632
- [35] F.W. Wilson, Smoothing derivatives of functions and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **139** (1969), 413–428
- [36] D. Xiao & W. Li, Limit cycles for the competitive three dimensional Lotka-Volterra systems. *J. Differential Eqns.* **164** (2000), 1–15
- [37] E.C. Zeeman, Classification of quadratic carrying simplices in two-dimensional competitive Lotka-Volterra systems. *Nonlinearity* **15** (2002), 1993–2018
- [38] M.L. Zeeman, personal communication (1995)

- [39] M.L. Zeeman, Hopf bifurcations in competitive three-dimensional Lotka-Volterra systems. *Dynamics and Stability of Systems* **8** (1993), 189–217
- [40] M.L. Zeeman, <http://www.bowdoin.edu/faculty/m/mlzeeman/index.shtml>
- [41] E.C. Zeeman & M.L. Zeeman, On the convexity of carrying simplices in competitive Lotka-Volterra systems. “Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems, and Control Science,” *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.* **152** 353–364. Dekker, New York 1994
- [42] E.C. Zeeman & M.L. Zeeman, An n -dimensional competitive Lotka-Volterra system is generically determined by the edges of its carrying simplex. *Nonlinearity* **15** (2002), 2019–2032
- [43] E.C. Zeeman & M.L. Zeeman From local to global behavior in competitive Lotka-Volterra systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **355** (2003), 713–734 (electronic)